

October 21, 2005  
Case No.: 7290/6  
Serial No.: 09/898,509  
Filed: July 3, 2001  
Page 5 of 9

**REMARKS**

Drawings. The Applicant is currently submitting a new set of formal drawings that are legible and suitable quality for publication.

Claims. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Luu objected to and rejected pending claims 1-14 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each objection and rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112:

A. Examiner Luu objected to claims 1, 3 and 9 on an informal basis

The Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 3 and 9 accurately recite "sending an electronic yard sign from a communication node on a selected list" as taught by the present application, particularly in connection with FIG. 6. Withdrawal of the objection of claims 1, 3, and 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

B. Examiner Luu rejected claims 1, 3, 7-9, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,311,190 to *Bayer* et al.

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Luu's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1, 3, 7-9, 13 and 14 over *Bayer*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Bayer*. To warrant this anticipation rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-9, 13 and 14, *Bayer* must show each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 3 and 9 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1 and 10. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this anticipation rejection of independent claims 1, 3 and 9, because *Bayer* fails to show the following limitations of independent claims 1, 3 and 9 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1, 3 and 9:

October 21, 2005  
Case No.: 7290/6  
Serial No.: 09/898,509  
Filed: July 3, 2001  
Page 6 of 9

1. "sending an electronic yard sign from a communication node on a selected list, the electronic yard sign including and at least one recipient function" as recited in independent claims 1 and 3; and
2. "means for sending an electronic yard sign from a communication node on a selected list, the electronic yard sign including a recipient function" as recited in independent claim 9.

Specifically, the present application teaches the term "an electronic yard sign" as being "an electronic re-creation of physical campaign yard signs that are placed in yards during campaigns across the country". *See, U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/898,509* at page 3, lines 23-25. By comparison, *Bayer* teaches a system for conducting surveys to voters in multiple different languages and registering the voters over a network like the Internet. *See, Bayer* at the Abstract. A careful review of *Bayer* clearly reveals that none of the surveys as taught by *Bayer* can be legally interpreted for patentable purposes as "an electronic re-creation of physical campaign yard signs that are placed in yards during campaigns across the country" as encompassed by the term "an electronic sign" recited in independent claim 1, 3 and 9.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Bayer* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from independent claim 3. Therefore, dependent claims 7 and 8 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 3. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 7 and 8 are allowable over *Bayer* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 3 being allowable over *Bayer*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Bayer* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 21, 2005  
Case No.: 7290/6  
Serial No.: 09/898,509  
Filed: July 3, 2001  
Page 7 of 9

Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claims 13 and 14 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 13 and 14 are allowable over *Bayer* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *Bayer*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Bayer* is therefore respectfully requested.

- C. Examiner Luu rejected claims 2, 4-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,190 to *Bayer et al.*

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 2 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 2 is allowable over *Bayer* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Bayer*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bayer* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6 depend from independent claim 3. Therefore, dependent claims 4-6 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 3. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 4-6 are allowable over *Bayer* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 3 being allowable over *Bayer*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bayer* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 21, 2005  
Case No.: 7290/6  
Serial No.: 09/898,509  
Filed: July 3, 2001  
Page 8 of 9

Claims 10-12 depend from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claims 10-12 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 10-12 are allowable over *Bayer* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *Bayer*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bayer* is therefore respectfully requested.

**D. New claims 15-17**

The prior art does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of claims 15-17, and claims 15-17 are therefore patentable over the prior art.

October 21, 2005  
Case No.: 7290/6  
Serial No.: 09/898,509  
Filed: July 3, 2001  
Page 9 of 9


### SUMMARY

Examiner Luu's objection of claims 1, 3 and 9 has been obviated herein by remarks supporting the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 9. Examiner Luu's rejection of claims 1-14 has been obviated herein by remarks supporting an allowance of claims 1-14 over *Bayer*. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-17 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Luu is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: October 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,  
Ravneet Singh

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant